

Superfield approach to a novel symmetry for non-Abelian gauge theory

R.P.Malik *

*S. N. Bose National Centre for Basic Sciences,
Block-JD, Sector-III, Salt Lake, Calcutta-700 098, India*

Abstract: In the framework of superfield formalism, we demonstrate the existence of a new local, covariant, continuous and nilpotent (dual-BRST) symmetry for the BRST invariant Lagrangian density of a self-interacting two $(1+1)$ -dimensional (2D) non-Abelian gauge theory (having no interaction with matter fields). The local and nilpotent Noether conserved charges corresponding to the above continuous symmetries find their geometrical interpretation as the translation generators along the odd (Grassmannian) directions of the four $(2+2)$ -dimensional compact supermanifold.

*E-mail address: malik@boson.bose.res.in

1 Introduction

For the covariant canonical quantization of the (non-)Abelian gauge theories (endowed with the first-class constraints in the language of Dirac [1,2]), the Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin (BRST) symmetry [3,4] plays a decisive role where unitarity and gauge invariance are respected together at any arbitrary order of perturbation theory. The BRST formalism is indispensable in the context of modern developments in topological field theories [5-7] and (super)string theories (see, e.g., Ref.[8] and references therein). Its elegant extension to include second-class constraints in its folds [9], its mathematically consistent inclusion in the Batalin-Vilkovisky formalism [10,11], its geometrical interpretation in the framework of superfield formulation [12-16], etc., have elevated the subject of BRST formalism to a level where physical ideas (connected with the gauge theories) and underlying mathematical concepts (related to the differential geometry and cohomology) have merged together in such a fashion that it has become an exciting and interesting area of research for the past many years. Recently, in a set of papers [17-21], a possible connection between the local, continuous and covariant symmetries and their generators on the one hand and the de Rham cohomology operators [†] of differential geometry on the other hand, has been established in the Lagrangian formulation for the case of 2D free- as well as interacting (non-)Abelian gauge theories. Exploiting these symmetries, the topological nature of 2D free Abelian- and self-interacting non-Abelian gauge theories (having no interaction with matter fields) has been demonstrated [22]. The existence of such kind of local symmetries has also been shown for the physical $(3+1)$ -dimensional (4D) free two-form Abelian gauge theory [23].

In the superfield approach [12-16] to BRST formalism for the p -form ($p = 1, 2, 3, \dots$) gauge theories, the curvature $((p+1)$ -form) tensor is restricted to be flat along the Grassmannian directions of the $(D+2)$ -dimensional supermanifold, parametrized by D - number of spacetime (even) coordinates and two Grassmannian (odd) coordinates. This flatness condition, popularly known as horizontality condition [‡], provides the origin for the existence of (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations and leads to the geometrical interpretation of the conserved and nilpotent ($Q_b^2 = 0, \bar{Q}_b^2 = 0$) (anti-)BRST charges $(\bar{Q}_b)Q_b$ as the translation generators along the Grassmannian directions of the $(D+2)$ -dimensional supermanifold. In this derivation, the super exterior derivative $\tilde{d}$ and the Maurer-Cartan equation for the definition of the curvature tensor are exploited together for the imposition of the horizontality condition. In a recent paper [25], all the three super de Rham cohomology operators, defined on the $(2+2)$ -dimensional supermanifold, have been exploited to show the existence of (anti-)BRST- and (anti-)co-BRST symmetries as well as a bosonic symmetry for the case of a free 2D Abelian gauge theory in the framework of superfield formulation. The

[†]On an ordinary spacetime manifold without a boundary, the set (d, δ, Δ) (with $d = dx^\mu \partial_\mu$, $\delta = \pm * d *$, $\Delta = d\delta + \delta d$, $*$ = Hodge duality operation) is known as the de Rham cohomology operators of differential geometry where $(\delta)d$ and Δ are the (co)-exterior derivatives and the Laplacian operator respectively. They obey an algebra: $d^2 = \delta^2 = 0$, $[\Delta, d] = [\Delta, \delta] = 0$, $\Delta = (\delta + d)^2$ showing that Δ is the Casimir operator.

[‡]This restriction has been referred to as the “soul-flatness” condition in Ref. [24] which amounts to setting the Grassmannian components of the super curvature $((p+1)$ -form) tensor equal to zero.

logical explanation for the existence of BRST- and co-BRST symmetries has been pointed out by exploiting the interplay between discrete and continuous symmetries [25].

The purpose of the present paper is to show the existence of a new local, covariant, continuous and nilpotent symmetry for the 2D self-interacting non-Abelian gauge theory by exploiting the mathematical power of the super co-exterior derivative ($\tilde{\delta}$) of the super de Rham cohomology operators. Here $\tilde{\delta} = \pm \star \tilde{d} \star$ is the super co-exterior derivative on the $(2+2)$ -dimensional supermanifold with $\star$ as the Hodge duality operation. We show that the imposition of an analogue of the horizontality condition w.r.t. super cohomological operator $\tilde{\delta}$ leads to the derivation of (anti-)co-BRST symmetry which is exactly identical to the corresponding symmetry discussed in the Lagrangian formulation *alone* [19,22]. As the (anti-)BRST charges $(\bar{Q}_b)Q_b$ turn out to be the generators of translation along the Grassmannian directions of the supermanifold, in a similar fashion, the conserved and nilpotent ($Q_d^2 = \bar{Q}_d^2 = 0$) (anti-)co-BRST charges $(\bar{Q}_d)Q_d$ find their geometrical interpretation as the translation generators along the Grassmannian directions of the $(2+2)$ -dimensional supermanifold. We also demonstrate that there is a mapping between super cohomological operators and conserved charges of the theory as: $\tilde{D} = \tilde{d} + \tilde{A} \Leftrightarrow (Q_b, \bar{Q}_b), \tilde{\delta} \Leftrightarrow (Q_d, \bar{Q}_d)$ where $\tilde{D}$ is the super covariant derivative and $\tilde{A}$ is the connection super one-form. Even though the anti-commutator of the (anti-)BRST- and (anti-)co-BRST symmetry transformations is a bosonic symmetry for the Lagrangian density, it is not possible to obtain this symmetry from the anti-commutator of operators $\tilde{D} = \tilde{d} + \tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{\delta}$. We argue about this problem and try to provide a mathematical reasoning for the absence of this symmetry for the non-Abelian gauge theory in the framework of superfield formulation.

The material of our paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2, we briefly recapitulate the key points of our earlier works on self-interacting 2D non-Abelian gauge theory [19,22] and set up the notations as well as conventions. Section 3 is devoted to a concise description of (anti-)BRST symmetries in the framework of superfield formulation [14,15]. In Sec. 4, we exploit the super operator $\tilde{\delta}$ (together with an analogue of the horizontality condition w.r.t. this operator) for the derivation of (anti-)co-BRST symmetries. Finally, in Sec. 5, we make some concluding remarks and discuss critically the mathematical reasons for the absence of a bosonic symmetry for the non-Abelian gauge theory (that exists naturally in the Abelian case [25] due to the Laplacian operator $\Delta = d\delta + \delta d$).

2 Preliminary: (anti-)BRST- and (anti-)co-BRST symmetries

Let us start off with the BRST invariant Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}_b$ for the self-interacting two $(1+1)$ -dimensional [§] non-Abelian gauge theory in the Feynman gauge [24,26-28]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_b &= -\frac{1}{4} F^{\mu\nu} \cdot F_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu A^\mu) \cdot (\partial_\nu A^\nu) - i \partial_\mu \bar{C} \cdot D^\mu C, \\ &\equiv \frac{1}{2} E \cdot E - \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu A^\mu) \cdot (\partial_\nu A^\nu) - i \partial_\mu \bar{C} \cdot D^\mu C, \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

[§]We follow here the conventions and notations such that the 2D flat Minkowski metric is: $\eta_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(+1, -1)$ and $\square = \eta^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \partial_\nu = (\partial_0)^2 - (\partial_1)^2$, $\varepsilon_{\mu\nu} = -\varepsilon^{\mu\nu}$, $F_{01}^a = E^a = \partial_0 A_1^a - \partial_1 A_0^a + f^{abc} A_0^b A_1^c = F^{10a}$, $\varepsilon_{01} = \varepsilon^{10} = +1$, $D_\mu C^a = \partial_\mu C^a + f^{abc} A_\mu^b C^c$, $\alpha \cdot \beta = \alpha^a \beta^a$, $(\alpha \times \beta)^a = f^{abc} \alpha^b \beta^c$ where α and β are the non-null vectors in the group space. Here the Greek indices: $\mu, \nu, \rho \dots = 0, 1$ correspond to spacetime directions.

where $F_{\mu\nu}^a = \partial_\mu A_\nu^a - \partial_\nu A_\mu^a + (A_\mu \times A_\nu)^a$ is the field strength tensor derived from the one-form connection $A = dx^\mu A_\mu^a T^a$ by Maurer-Cartan equation $F = dA + A \wedge A$ with $(F = \frac{1}{2} dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu F_{\mu\nu}^a T^a)$. Here T^a are the generators of the compact Lie algebra $[T^a, T^b] = f^{abc} T^c$ where f^{abc} are the structure constants that can be chosen to be totally antisymmetric in a, b, c (see, e.g., Ref.[28] for details). The Latin indices $a, b, c, \dots = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ correspond to the group indices (in the colour space for the non-Abelian gauge theory). The anti-commuting $((C^a)^2 = (\bar{C}^a)^2 = 0, C^a \bar{C}^b + \bar{C}^b C^a = 0)$ (anti-)ghost fields $(\bar{C}^a) C^a$ (which interact only with gauge fields A_μ^a in the loop diagrams) are required to be present in the theory to maintain the unitarity and gauge invariance together. The auxiliary fields B^a and $\mathcal{B}^a$ can be introduced to linearize the gauge-fixing term $-\frac{1}{2}[(\partial_\mu A^\mu)^a]^2$ (in the Feynman gauge) and the kinetic energy term $\frac{1}{2}(E^a)^2$ (because there is no magnetic component of $F_{\mu\nu}^a$ for the $(1+1)$ -dimensional (2D) non-Abelian gauge theory) as

$$\mathcal{L}_B = \mathcal{B} \cdot E - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{B} \cdot \mathcal{B} + B \cdot (\partial_\mu A^\mu) + \frac{1}{2} B \cdot B - i \partial_\mu \bar{C} \cdot D^\mu C. \quad (2.2)$$

The above Lagrangian density (2.1) respects the following off-shell nilpotent ($s_b^2 = 0, s_d^2 = 0$) BRST (s_b) $\P$ - and dual(co)-BRST (s_d) symmetry transformations [19,22]

$$\begin{aligned} s_b A_\mu &= D_\mu C, & s_b C &= -\frac{1}{2} C \times C, & s_b \bar{C} &= iB, \\ s_b \mathcal{B} &= \mathcal{B} \times C, & s_b B &= 0, & s_b E &= E \times C, \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} s_d A_\mu &= -\varepsilon_{\mu\nu} \partial^\nu \bar{C}, & s_d \bar{C} &= 0, & s_d C &= -i\mathcal{B}, \\ s_d \mathcal{B} &= 0, & s_d B &= 0, & s_d E &= D_\mu \partial^\mu \bar{C}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

The anti-commutator of these nilpotent, local, continuous and covariant symmetries (i.e. $s_w = \{s_b, s_d\}$) leads to a bosonic symmetry $\parallel s_w$ ($s_w^2 \neq 0$) transformations [19,22]

$$\begin{aligned} s_w A_\mu &= D_\mu \mathcal{B} + \varepsilon_{\mu\nu} \partial^\nu B - i \varepsilon_{\mu\nu} \partial^\nu \bar{C} \times C, & s_w C &= 0, & s_w \bar{C} &= 0, \\ s_w (\partial_\mu A^\mu) &= \partial_\mu D^\mu \mathcal{B} + i \varepsilon^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \bar{C} \times \partial_\nu C, & s_w B &= 0, \\ s_w E &= D_\mu (\partial^\mu \bar{C} \times C) - \varepsilon^{\mu\nu} D_\mu D_\nu \mathcal{B} - D_\mu \partial^\mu B, & s_w \mathcal{B} &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

under which the Lagrangian density (2.2) transforms to a total derivative $\ast\ast$.

Besides BRST- and co-BRST symmetry transformations (2.3) and (2.4), there are anti-BRST- and anti-co-BRST symmetries that are also present in the theory. To realize these, one has to introduce another auxiliary field $\bar{B}$ (satisfying $B + \bar{B} = i C \times \bar{C}$) to recast the Lagrangian density (2.2) into the following forms [30]

$$\mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}} = \mathcal{B} \cdot E - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{B} \cdot \mathcal{B} + B \cdot (\partial_\mu A^\mu) + \frac{1}{2} (B \cdot B + \bar{B} \cdot \bar{B}) - i \partial_\mu \bar{C} \cdot D^\mu C, \quad (2.6a)$$

$\P$ We adopt here the notations and conventions of Ref. [28]. In fact, in its full glory, a nilpotent ($\delta_B^2 = 0$) BRST transformation δ_B is equivalent to the product of an anti-commuting ($\eta C^a = -C^a \eta, \eta \bar{C}^a = -\bar{C}^a \eta$) spacetime independent parameter η and s_b (i.e. $\delta_B = \eta s_b$) where $s_b^2 = 0$.

$\parallel$ This symmetry has *not* been discussed in Ref. [29] where the nilpotent transformations (2.3) and (2.4) have been analyzed (without indicating their possible connections with the de Rham cohomology operators) on a compact Riemann surface. We thank Prof. N. Nakanishi for bringing to our notice Ref. [29].

$\ast\ast$ The Lagrangian density (2.1) transforms to a total derivative under the transformations: $\tilde{s}_w A_\mu = D_\mu E - \varepsilon_{\mu\nu} \partial^\nu (\partial_\rho A^\rho) - i \varepsilon_{\mu\nu} \partial^\nu \bar{C} \times C, \tilde{s}_w C = 0, \tilde{s}_w \bar{C} = 0$. This observation will be discussed in Sec.5.

$$\mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}} = \mathcal{B} \cdot E - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{B} \cdot \mathcal{B} - \bar{B} \cdot (\partial_\mu A^\mu) + \frac{1}{2} (B \cdot B + \bar{B} \cdot \bar{B}) - i D_\mu \bar{C} \cdot \partial^\mu C. \quad (2.6b)$$

The Lagrangian density (2.6b) transforms to a total derivative under the following off-shell nilpotent anti-BRST ($\bar{s}_b$)- and (anti-)co-BRST ($\bar{s}_d$) symmetry transformations [19,22]

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{s}_b A_\mu &= D_\mu \bar{C}, & \bar{s}_b \bar{C} &= -\frac{1}{2} \bar{C} \times \bar{C}, & \bar{s}_b C &= i \bar{B}, & \bar{s}_b \bar{B} &= 0, \\ \bar{s}_b E &= E \times \bar{C}, & \bar{s}_b \mathcal{B} &= \mathcal{B} \times \bar{C}, & \bar{s}_b B &= B \times \bar{C}, & \bar{s}_b (\partial_\mu A^\mu) &= \partial_\mu D^\mu \bar{C}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{s}_d A_\mu &= -\varepsilon_{\mu\nu} \partial^\nu C, & \bar{s}_d C &= 0, & \bar{s}_d \bar{C} &= +i \mathcal{B}, & \bar{s}_d \mathcal{B} &= 0, \\ \bar{s}_d E &= D_\mu \partial^\mu C, & \bar{s}_d \bar{B} &= 0, & \bar{s}_d B &= 0, & \bar{s}_d (\partial_\mu A^\mu) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

The anti-commutator of these nilpotent symmetries leads to the transformations equivalent to (2.5) (see, e.g., Ref. [19]). All the above continuous symmetry transformations can be concisely expressed, in terms of the Noether conserved charges Q_r [19,22], as

$$s_r \Psi = -i [\Psi, Q_r]_\pm, \quad Q_r = Q_b, \bar{Q}_b, Q_d, \bar{Q}_d, Q_w, Q_g, \quad (2.10)$$

where brackets $[\ , \]_\pm$ stand for the (anti-)commutators for any arbitrary generic field Ψ being (fermionic) bosonic in nature. Here the conserved ghost charge Q_g generates the continuous scale transformations: $C \rightarrow e^{-\Sigma} C, \bar{C} \rightarrow e^\Sigma \bar{C}, A_\mu \rightarrow A_\mu, B \rightarrow B, \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}, \bar{B} \rightarrow \bar{B}$ (where Σ is a global parameter). The local expression for Q_r are given in Refs. [19,22].

3 Horizontality condition and (anti-)BRST symmetries

We begin here with a four $(2+2)$ -dimensional compact supermanifold parametrized by the superspace coordinates $Z^M = (x^\mu, \theta, \bar{\theta})$ where $x^\mu (\mu = 0, 1)$ are the two even (bosonic) spacetime coordinates and θ and $\bar{\theta}$ are the two odd (Grassmannian) coordinates (with $\theta^2 = \bar{\theta}^2 = 0, \theta\bar{\theta} + \bar{\theta}\theta = 0$). On this supermanifold, one can define a supervector superfield V_s with the following component multiplet superfields [14-16]

$$V_s = (B_\mu(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}), \Phi(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}), \bar{\Phi}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta})), \quad (3.1)$$

where the group valued superfields $B_\mu = B_\mu^a T^a, \Phi = \Phi^a T^a, \bar{\Phi} = \bar{\Phi}^a T^a$ can be expanded in terms of the basic fields ($A_\mu = A_\mu^a T^a, C = C^a T^a, \bar{C} = \bar{C}^a T^a$) and auxiliary fields ($B = B^a T^a, \bar{B} = \bar{B}^a T^a, \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}^a T^a$) of (2.6) and some extra secondary fields as follows

$$\begin{aligned} (B_\mu^a T^a)(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= (A_\mu^a T^a)(x) + \theta (\bar{R}_\mu^a T^a)(x) + \bar{\theta} (R_\mu^a T^a)(x) + i \theta \bar{\theta} (S_\mu^a T^a)(x), \\ (\Phi^a T^a)(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= (C^a T^a)(x) + i \theta (\bar{B}^a T^a)(x) + i \bar{\theta} (\mathcal{B}^a T^a)(x) + i \theta \bar{\theta} (s^a T^a)(x), \\ (\bar{\Phi}^a T^a)(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= (\bar{C}^a T^a)(x) + i \theta (\mathcal{B}^a T^a)(x) + i \bar{\theta} (B^a T^a)(x) + i \theta \bar{\theta} (\bar{s}^a T^a)(x). \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

The expansions are along the odd (fermionic) superspace coordinates θ and $\bar{\theta}$ and even (bosonic) $(\theta\bar{\theta})$ directions of the supermanifold. All the fields are local functions of spacetime coordinates x^μ alone (i.e., $A_\mu(x, 0, 0) = A_\mu(x), C^a(x, 0, 0) = C^a(x)$ etc.). It is straightforward to see that the local fields $R_\mu^a(x), \bar{R}_\mu^a(x), C^a(x), \bar{C}^a(x), s^a(x), \bar{s}^a(x)$ are fermionic (anti-commuting) in nature and the bosonic (commuting) local fields are: $A_\mu^a(x), S_\mu^a(x), \mathcal{B}^a(x), \bar{\mathcal{B}}^a(x), B^a(x), \bar{B}^a(x)$ in the above expansion so that bosonic- and

fermionic degrees of freedom can match. This requirement is essential for the validity and sanctity of any arbitrary supersymmetric theory in the superfield formulation. In fact, all the secondary fields will be expressed in terms of basic fields due to the restrictions emerging from the application of “horizontality” condition on the super curvature (2-form) tensor $\tilde{F}$, defined through Maurer-Cartan equation, as

$$\tilde{F} = \frac{1}{2} (dZ^M \wedge dZ^N) \tilde{F}_{MN} = \tilde{d}\tilde{A} + \tilde{A} \wedge \tilde{A} \equiv \tilde{D}\tilde{A}, \quad (3.3)$$

where covariant superderivative operator $\tilde{D} = \tilde{d} + \tilde{A}$ is the generalization of the ordinary covariant derivative operator $D = d + A$. Here super exterior derivative $\tilde{d}$ and connection super one-form $\tilde{A}$ are defined, in terms of super differentials $dZ^M = (dx^\mu, d\theta, d\bar{\theta})$ and component superfields ($B_\mu = B_\mu^a T^a, \Phi = \Phi^a T^a, \bar{\Phi} = \bar{\Phi}^a T^a$) of (3.1), as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{d} &= dZ^M \partial_M = dx^\mu \partial_\mu + d\theta \partial_\theta + d\bar{\theta} \partial_{\bar{\theta}}, \\ \tilde{A} &= dZ^M \tilde{A}_M = dx^\mu B_\mu(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) + d\theta \bar{\Phi}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) + d\bar{\theta} \Phi(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

where partial derivatives, with respect to superspace coordinates, are

$$\partial_M = \frac{\partial}{\partial Z^M}, \quad \partial_\mu = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}, \quad \partial_\theta = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}, \quad \partial_{\bar{\theta}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\theta}}. \quad (3.5)$$

Now we impose the “horizontality” condition on $\tilde{F}$. Mathematically, this amounts to the imposition of the following restriction [12-16]

$$\tilde{F} = \tilde{d}\tilde{A} + \tilde{A} \wedge \tilde{A} \equiv dA + A \wedge A = F \equiv DA, \quad (3.6)$$

where $A \wedge A = \frac{1}{2} dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu [A_\mu, A_\nu] \equiv \frac{1}{2} dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu (A_\mu \times A_\nu)$. In words, this requirement implies the “flatness” of all the components of the super curvature (2-form) tensor $\tilde{F}_{MN}$ that are directed along the θ and/or $\bar{\theta}$ directions of the supermanifold. More explicitly, this restriction requires setting of the coefficients of $dx^\mu \wedge d\theta, dx^\mu \wedge d\bar{\theta}, d\theta \wedge d\bar{\theta}, d\theta \wedge d\theta, d\bar{\theta} \wedge d\bar{\theta}$ equal to zero. To achieve this, we expand the l.h.s. of (3.6) where the individual terms are

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{d}\tilde{A} &= (dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu) (\partial_\mu B_\nu) - (d\theta \wedge d\theta) (\partial_\theta \bar{\Phi}) + (dx^\mu \wedge d\bar{\theta}) (\partial_\mu \Phi - \partial_{\bar{\theta}} B_\mu) \\ &- (d\theta \wedge d\bar{\theta}) (\partial_\theta \Phi + \partial_{\bar{\theta}} \bar{\Phi}) + (dx^\mu \wedge d\theta) (\partial_\mu \bar{\Phi} - \partial_\theta B_\mu) - (d\bar{\theta} \wedge d\bar{\theta}) (\partial_{\bar{\theta}} \Phi), \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A} \wedge \tilde{A} &= (dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu) (B_\mu B_\nu) - (d\theta \wedge d\theta) (\bar{\Phi} \bar{\Phi}) + (dx^\mu \wedge d\bar{\theta}) (B_\mu \Phi - \Phi B_\mu) \\ &- (d\theta \wedge d\bar{\theta}) (\bar{\Phi} \Phi + \Phi \bar{\Phi}) + (dx^\mu \wedge d\theta) (B_\mu \bar{\Phi} - \bar{\Phi} B_\mu) - (d\bar{\theta} \wedge d\bar{\theta}) (\Phi \Phi). \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Ultimately, the application of soul-flatness (horizontality) condition, in its gory details, leads to the following relationships [14,15]

$$\begin{aligned} R_\mu(x) &= D_\mu C(x), \quad \bar{R}_\mu(x) = D_\mu \bar{C}(x), \quad s(x) = (\bar{B} \times C)(x), \\ S_\mu(x) &= D_\mu B(x) - i(D_\mu C \times \bar{C})(x) \equiv -D_\mu \bar{B}(x) + i(D_\mu \bar{C} \times C)(x), \\ \mathcal{B}(x) &= \frac{i}{2} (C \times C)(x), \quad \bar{\mathcal{B}}(x) = \frac{i}{2} (\bar{C} \times \bar{C})(x), \quad \bar{s}(x) = -(B \times \bar{C})(x), \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

which demonstrates that all the secondary fields can be expressed in terms of the basic- and auxiliary fields of the Lagrangian density (2.6). Besides the above relations (3.9), the

horizontality condition also leads to the systematic derivation of the relationship $B + \bar{B} = i(C \times \bar{C})$ [30] which results in from setting the coefficient of $(d\theta \wedge d\bar{\theta})$ equal to zero.

The insertion of all the above values for $R_\mu, \bar{R}_\mu, S_\mu, \mathcal{B}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}, s, \bar{s}$ in the expansion (3.2) leads to the derivation of (anti-)BRST symmetries for the non-Abelian gauge theory. In addition, this exercise provides the physical interpretation for the (anti-)BRST charges as the generators of translations along the Grassmannian directions of the supermanifold. Both these observations can be succinctly expressed, in a combined way, as

$$\begin{aligned} B_\mu(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= A_\mu(x) + \theta(\bar{s}_b A_\mu(x)) + \bar{\theta}(s_b A_\mu(x)) + \theta\bar{\theta}(s_b \bar{s}_b A_\mu(x)), \\ \Phi(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= C(x) + \theta(\bar{s}_b C(x)) + \bar{\theta}(s_b C(x)) + \theta\bar{\theta}(s_b \bar{s}_b C(x)), \\ \bar{\Phi}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= \bar{C}(x) + \theta(\bar{s}_b \bar{C}(x)) + \bar{\theta}(s_b \bar{C}(x)) + \theta\bar{\theta}(s_b \bar{s}_b \bar{C}(x)), \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

It will be noticed that in this interpretation equations (2.3) (with $s_b \bar{B} = \bar{B} \times C$), (2.8) and (2.10) play very important role. In fact, it is the mathematical power of the cohomological super operator $\tilde{d}$ (along with the Maurer-Cartan equation) that provides the geometrical interpretation for Q_b and $\bar{Q}_b$ as translation generators (cf.(2.10),(3.10)). Thus, the mapping is: $\tilde{D} = \tilde{d} + \tilde{A} \Leftrightarrow (Q_b, \bar{Q}_b)$ but the ordinary exterior derivative $D = d + A$ (along with the Maurer-Cartan equation) is identified with Q_b *alone* because the latter increases the ghost number of a state by one [17–21] as D increases the degree of a form by one on which it operates. At this juncture, one noteworthy point is the fact that, after the imposition of the horizontality condition, the 2-form super curvature $\tilde{F}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta})$ for the Abelian gauge theory becomes an ordinary 2-form curvature (i.e., $\tilde{F}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) = F(x)$) [25]. The same does not hold good in the case of the non-Abelian gauge theory. In fact, even after the imposition of the horizontality condition, the 2-form super curvature tensor $\tilde{F} = (dZ^M \wedge dZ^N) \tilde{F}_{MN}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta})$ is:

$$\begin{aligned} (dZ^M \wedge dZ^N) \tilde{F}_{MN}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= (dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu) \{ F_{\mu\nu}(x) + \theta(F_{\mu\nu}(x) \times \bar{C}(x)) \\ &+ \bar{\theta}(F_{\mu\nu}(x) \times C(x)) + \theta\bar{\theta}[i(F_{\mu\nu}(x) \times B(x)) + (F_{\mu\nu}(x) \times \bar{C}(x)) \times C(x)] \}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

However, the kinetic energy term of the Lagrangian density (2.1) remains intact: (i.e., $-\frac{1}{4} F^{\mu\nu}(x) \cdot F_{\mu\nu}(x) = -\frac{1}{4} \tilde{F}^{MN}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) \cdot \tilde{F}_{MN}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta})$). This condition is trivially satisfied in the case of Abelian gauge theory where $\tilde{F}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) = F(x)$ [25].

4 Analogue of horizontality condition and (anti-)co-BRST symmetries

It is obvious from equation (3.6) that, on an ordinary 2D Minkowskian flat spacetime manifold, the two-form $F = DA \equiv dA + A \wedge A$ (constructed from $d = dx^\mu \partial_\mu$ and $A = dx^\mu A_\mu^a T^a$) defines the curvature tensor $F_{\mu\nu}^a = \partial_\mu A_\nu^a - \partial_\nu A_\mu^a + (A_\mu \times A_\nu)^a$ for the non-Abelian gauge theory. The operation of the 2D dual exterior derivative $\delta = - * d *$ on the connection one-form A (i.e., $\delta A = (\partial_\mu A^{\mu a} T^a)$) leads to the definition of the gauge-fixing term of the Lagrangian density (2.1). It is interesting to note that the action of the operator $\Omega = - * D *$ (constructed from covariant derivative $D = d + A$ and Hodge duality $*$ operation) on the 1-form A (with $*A = *(dx^\mu A_\mu) = \varepsilon^{\mu\nu} dx_\nu A_\mu$)

$$\Omega A \equiv - * D * A = - * (d * A + A \wedge * A) = - * d * A = \partial_\mu A^{\mu a} T^a, \quad (4.1)$$

also leads to the derivation of the gauge-fixing term. Of course, here we have used the fact that: $*(dx^\mu) = \varepsilon^{\mu\nu}(dx_\nu)$, $*(dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu) = \varepsilon^{\mu\nu}$, $(A_\mu \times A^\mu)^a = f^{abc} A_\mu^b A^{\mu c} = 0$. This argument persists with the super operators as well. Thus, for our all practical computations in this section, we shall concentrate on (super)operators $(\tilde{\delta})\delta$ and their operation on the connection super one-form $(\tilde{A})A$ for our discussion of analogue of the horizontality condition. Here, for the case of the $(2+2)$ -dimensional supermanifold, the super co-exterior derivative is: $\tilde{\delta} = -\star \tilde{d}\star$. The Hodge duality $\star$ operation on the super differentials (dZ^M) and their wedge products $(dZ^M \wedge dZ^N)$, $(dZ^M \wedge dZ^N \wedge dZ^P)$ etc., defined on this supermanifold, is

$$\begin{aligned}
\star(dx^\mu) &= \varepsilon^{\mu\nu}(dx_\nu \wedge d\theta \wedge d\bar{\theta}), & \star(d\theta) &= \frac{1}{2!}\varepsilon^{\mu\nu}(dx_\mu \wedge dx_\nu \wedge d\bar{\theta}), \\
\star(d\bar{\theta}) &= \frac{1}{2!}\varepsilon^{\mu\nu}(dx_\mu \wedge dx_\nu \wedge d\theta), & \star(dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu) &= \varepsilon^{\mu\nu}(d\theta \wedge d\bar{\theta}), \\
\star(dx^\mu \wedge d\theta) &= \varepsilon^{\mu\nu}(dx_\nu \wedge d\bar{\theta}), & \star(dx^\mu \wedge d\bar{\theta}) &= \varepsilon^{\mu\nu}(dx_\nu \wedge d\theta), \\
\star(d\theta \wedge d\theta) &= \frac{1}{2!} s^{\theta\theta} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu}(dx_\mu \wedge dx_\nu), & \star(d\theta \wedge d\bar{\theta}) &= \frac{1}{2!} s^{\theta\bar{\theta}} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu}(dx_\mu \wedge dx_\nu), \\
\star(d\bar{\theta} \wedge d\bar{\theta}) &= \frac{1}{2!} s^{\bar{\theta}\bar{\theta}} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu}(dx_\mu \wedge dx_\nu), & \star(dx_\mu \wedge d\theta \wedge d\bar{\theta}) &= \varepsilon_{\mu\nu}(dx^\nu), \\
\star(dx_\mu \wedge dx_\nu \wedge d\theta \wedge d\bar{\theta}) &= \varepsilon_{\mu\nu}, & \star(dx_\mu \wedge dx_\nu \wedge d\theta) &= \varepsilon_{\mu\nu}(d\bar{\theta}), \\
\star(dx_\mu \wedge dx_\nu \wedge d\bar{\theta}) &= \varepsilon_{\mu\nu}(d\theta), & \star(dx_\mu \wedge dx_\nu \wedge d\theta \wedge d\bar{\theta}) &= \varepsilon_{\mu\nu} s^{\theta\theta},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

where $s's$ are symmetric (e.g., $s^{\theta\bar{\theta}} = s^{\bar{\theta}\theta}$ etc.). In the above we have collected only a few of the $\star$ operations. The other $\star$ operations can be computed in an analogous manner. With these as the backdrop, we obtain the expression for the superscalar superfield $\tilde{\delta}\tilde{A} = -\star\tilde{d}\star\tilde{A}$ as

$$\tilde{\delta}\tilde{A} = (\partial_\mu B^\mu) + s^{\theta\theta}(\partial_\theta \Phi) + s^{\bar{\theta}\bar{\theta}}(\partial_{\bar{\theta}} \bar{\Phi}) + s^{\theta\bar{\theta}}(\partial_\theta \bar{\Phi} + \partial_{\bar{\theta}} \Phi). \tag{4.3}$$

It will be noted that we have dropped all the terms in the computation of $(\tilde{d}\star\tilde{A})$ which contain (i) more than two differentials in spacetime, and (ii) more than two differentials in Grassmannian variables. After this only, we have applied another $\star$ operation on it. Now we exploit the analogue of the horizontality condition w.r.t. $\tilde{\delta}$ (i.e., $\tilde{\delta}\tilde{A} = \delta A$) which is nothing but equating the r.h.s. of equations (4.1) and (4.3). In other words, we set the coefficients of $s^{\theta\theta}$, $s^{\bar{\theta}\bar{\theta}}$, $s^{\theta\bar{\theta}}$ equal to zero. The ensuing restrictions on the superfields are

$$\partial_\theta \bar{\Phi} + \partial_{\bar{\theta}} \Phi = 0, \quad \partial_\theta \Phi = 0, \quad \partial_{\bar{\theta}} \bar{\Phi} = 0. \tag{4.4}$$

Exploiting the expansions (3.2), it can be checked that the above restrictions lead to

$$s^a(x) = 0, \quad \bar{s}^a(x) = 0, \quad \mathcal{B}^a(x) + \bar{\mathcal{B}}^a(x) = 0, \quad B^a(x) = \bar{B}^a(x) = 0, \tag{4.5}$$

and the following conditions on the component fields of $B_\mu(x, \theta, \bar{\theta})$

$$\partial \cdot \bar{R} = 0, \quad \partial \cdot R = 0, \quad \partial \cdot S = 0. \tag{4.6}$$

In terms of solutions (4.5) and $R_\mu^a = -\varepsilon_{\mu\nu}\partial^\nu \bar{C}^a$, $\bar{R}_\mu^a = -\varepsilon_{\mu\nu}\partial^\nu C^a$, $S_\mu^a = -\varepsilon_{\mu\nu}\partial^\nu \mathcal{B}^a$, the superfield expansion (3.2) can be re-expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
B_\mu(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= A_\mu(x) - \theta \varepsilon_{\mu\nu} \partial^\nu C(x) - \bar{\theta} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu} \partial^\nu \bar{C}(x) - i \theta \bar{\theta} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu} \partial^\nu \mathcal{B}(x), \\
\Phi(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= C(x) + i \bar{\theta} \mathcal{B}(x), \quad \bar{\Phi}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) = \bar{C}(x) - i \theta \mathcal{B}(x).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Exploiting equations (2.4) and (2.9), we can write the above expansion in a form similar to (3.10). The resulting expansion, in terms of (anti-)co-BRST symmetries, is

$$\begin{aligned} B_\mu(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= A_\mu(x) + \theta (\bar{s}_d A_\mu(x)) + \bar{\theta} (s_d A_\mu(x)) + \theta \bar{\theta} (\bar{s}_d s_d A_\mu(x)), \\ \Phi(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= C(x) - \bar{\theta} (s_d C(x)), \quad \bar{\Phi}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) = \bar{C}(x) - \theta (\bar{s}_d \bar{C}(x)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

At this stage, it is interesting to compare and contrast the finer details of the expansion (3.10) and (4.7) which are connected with (anti-)BRST- and (anti-)co-BRST symmetries. We pin-point the facts that: (i) the (anti-)BRST and (anti-)co-BRST symmetry transformations are generated along the $\theta(\bar{\theta})$ directions of the supermanifold. (ii) The translation generators along the Grassmannian directions of the supermanifold are the conserved and nilpotent (anti-)BRST- and (anti-)co-BRST charges (cf.(2.10)). (iii) For the odd (fermionic) superfields, the translations are either along θ or $\bar{\theta}$ directions for the case of (anti-)co-BRST symmetries. This is not the case with (anti-)BRST symmetries (cf.(3.10)). (iv) For the bosonic superfield, the translations are along both θ as well as $\bar{\theta}$ directions when we consider (anti-)BRST- and/or (anti-)co-BRST symmetries. (v) Comparison between (3.10) and (4.7) shows that the (anti-)BRST transformations are along $(\theta)\bar{\theta}$ directions for the odd fields $(C)\bar{C}$. *On the contrary, the (anti-)co-BRST transformations are the other way around.* (vi) The restrictions $\tilde{\delta}\tilde{A} = \delta A$ and $\tilde{D}\tilde{A} = DA$ produce (anti-)co-BRST- and (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations. (vii) Form of the solutions (4.5) are such that it turns out to be the *straightforward* generalization of the (anti-)co-BRST symmetries for the Abelian gauge theory [25] as there are no structure constants f^{abc} anywhere in (4.5). In contrast, the form of the solutions in (3.9) do reflect the *non-trivial* generalization of the Abelian transformations [25] to the non-Abelian (anti-)BRST transformations. (viii) The expressions for R_μ and $\bar{R}_\mu$ in (3.9) and (4.5) are such that the kinetic energy- and gauge-fixing terms of (2.1) remain invariant under (anti-)BRST- and (anti-)co-BRST symmetries, respectively.

For the (anti-)co-BRST symmetries the mapping is: $\tilde{\delta} \Leftrightarrow (Q_d, \bar{Q}_d)$ but the ordinary co-exterior derivative δ is identified with Q_d *alone* because it decreases the ghost number of a state by one [19,22] as δ reduces the degree of a given form by one on which it operates.

5 Discussion

We have shown the existence of the local, covariant, continuous and nilpotent (anti-)BRST- and (anti-)co-BRST symmetries by exploiting the mathematical power of super operators $\tilde{D} = \tilde{d} + \tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{\delta}$ together with the idea of the generalized version of the ‘‘horizontality’’ condition [12-16]. In the framework of Lagrangian density alone, these symmetry transformations have been obtained in equations (2.3), (2.4), (2.8) and (2.9). In fact, there are six local, covariant, and continuous symmetry transformations in the theory which have been discussed in Sec. 2. They obey the following algebra:

$$\begin{aligned} s_b^2 = s_d^2 = \bar{s}_b^2 = \bar{s}_d^2 = 0, \quad s_w = \{s_b, s_d\} = \{\bar{s}_b, \bar{s}_d\}, \\ s_d \bar{s}_d + \bar{s}_d s_d = 0, \quad s_b \bar{s}_b + \bar{s}_b s_b = 0, \quad [s_w, s_r] = 0, \quad s_r = s_b, \bar{s}_b, s_d, \bar{s}_d, s_g, \\ i[s_g, s_b] = +s_b, \quad i[s_g, s_d] = -s_d, \quad i[s_g, \bar{s}_b] = -\bar{s}_b, \quad i[s_g, \bar{s}_d] = +\bar{s}_d, \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

which is reminiscent of the algebra obeyed by the ordinary de Rham cohomology operators [31-34] of differential geometry (see, e.g., one of the foot-notes in Sec.1) defined on the flat ordinary compact manifold. In fact, for the free Abelian (two-dimensional one-form as well as four-dimensional two-form) gauge theories, it has been shown [17,18,22,23] that there is one-to-one correspondence between local symmetry transformations for the Lagrangian density (and corresponding generators) on the one hand and the de Rham cohomology operators (d, δ, Δ) on the other hand. The existence of a discrete symmetry for the Lagrangian density has been shown to correspond to the Hodge $(*)$ duality operation of the differential geometry. In our recent work [25], we have exploited the mathematical power of super de Rham cohomology operators $(\tilde{d}, \tilde{\delta}, \tilde{\Delta} = \tilde{d}\tilde{\delta} + \tilde{\delta}\tilde{d})$ to demonstrate the geometrical origin for the (anti-) BRST- and (anti-)co-BRST charges as the translation generators along the Grassmannian directions of the $(2+2)$ -dimensional supermanifold. A bosonic symmetry (which is equivalent to the anti-commutator of these two nilpotent symmetries) is shown to correspond to the translation along the bosonic $\theta\bar{\theta}$ -direction (equivalent to a couple of intertwined Grassmannian directions) of the supermanifold. The bosonic generator for this symmetry is shown to owe its origin to the Laplacian operator. In fact, the Hodge decomposed versions for the 2D vector fields (i.e., $R_\mu, \bar{R}_\mu, S_\mu$) emerge very naturally when we exploit the Laplacian operator to show the existence of the bosonic symmetry by requiring the fermionic fields $(R_\mu, \bar{R}_\mu, s, \bar{s})$ - as well as auxiliary fields $(B, \bar{B}, \mathcal{B}, \bar{\mathcal{B}})$ to be zero in the expansion (3.2). This trick does not work in the case of non-Abelian gauge theory because the mathematical operators (we are dealing with) are: $D = d + A$ and $\Omega = - * D * \equiv \delta$. These operators do not form a closed algebra. In contrast, for the Abelian case, the de Rham cohomology operators (d, δ, Δ) do close among themselves. In addition, there is no analogue of the Hodge duality $(*)$ operation as a discrete symmetry transformation for the case of non-Abelian gauge theory. Thus, even though the 2D self-interacting non-Abelian gauge theory is a topological field theory [22] (like 2D free Abelian gauge theory), it is not an exact field theoretical model for the Hodge theory. In fact, when we exploit the analogue of the horizontality condition w.r.t. the super operator $\tilde{\delta}\tilde{D} + \tilde{D}\tilde{\delta}$, namely;

$$(\tilde{\delta}\tilde{D} + \tilde{D}\tilde{\delta})\tilde{A} = (\delta D + D\delta)A \equiv dx^\rho [D_\rho(\partial_\mu A^\mu) - \varepsilon_{\rho\sigma}\partial^\sigma E], \quad (5.2)$$

we do not obtain the Hodge decomposed version for the 2D vector fields $(R_\mu, \bar{R}_\mu, S_\mu)$. Furthermore, neither of the bosonic symmetries s_w (or its on-shell equivalent $\tilde{s}_w$) emerge from the above condition. In fact, it can be also clearly seen that the following horizontality restrictions with operators $\tilde{\Omega} = - * \tilde{D} *$ and $\tilde{D} = \tilde{d} + \tilde{A}$

$$(\tilde{\Omega}\tilde{D} + \tilde{D}\tilde{\Omega})\tilde{A} = (\Omega D + D\Omega)A \equiv dx^\rho [D_\rho(\partial_\mu A^\mu) - \varepsilon_{\rho\sigma}D^\sigma E], \quad (5.3)$$

do not lead to the derivation of the bosonic symmetry s_w (or its on-shell equivalent $\tilde{s}_w$) by invoking the requirements: $R_\mu = \bar{R}_\mu = s = \bar{s} = 0$ and $B = \bar{B} = \mathcal{B} = \bar{\mathcal{B}} = 0$. On the contrary, for the 2D free Abelian one-form gauge theory [25], we have demonstrated that the analogue of the horizontality condition $\tilde{\Delta}\tilde{A} = \Delta A$ leads to the derivation of the on-shell

version $\tilde{s}_w$ (of the bosonic symmetry s_w) which is consistent with the Hodge decomposition of the 2D vectors R_μ and $\bar{R}_\mu$.

At the moment, it is an open problem to find out the mathematical resolution for the existence of the bosonic symmetry s_w (or its equivalent $\tilde{s}_w$) for the 2D non-Abelian gauge theory. It will also be important to express the topological features of these 2D theories in the language of the geometrical superfield formulation. These are some of the issues that are under investigation and our results will be reported elsewhere [35].

References

- [1] P. A. M. Dirac, *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics*, (Yeshiva University Press, New York, 1964).
- [2] For a review, see, e.g., K. Sundermeyer, *Constrained Dynamics (Lecture Notes in Physics)*, **Vol. 169**, (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1982).
- [3] C. Becchi, A. Rouet and R. Stora, *Phys. Lett.* **B 32**, 344 (1974); *Commun. Math. Phys.* **42**, 127 (1975); *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **98**, 287 (1976).
- [4] I. V. Tyutin, *Lebedev Institute Report No.:* FIAN-39 (1975) (Unpublished).
- [5] A. S. Schwarz, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **2**, 247 (1978).
- [6] E. Witten, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **117**, 353 (1988); *ibid.* **121**, 351 (1989).
- [7] For a review, see, e.g., D. Birmingham, M. Blau, M. Rakowski and G. Thompson, *Phys. Rep.* **20**, 129 (1991).
- [8] M. B. Green, J. H. Schwarz and E. Witten, *Superstring Theory*, **Vols. 1 and 2**, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987).
- [9] I. A. Batalin and I. V. Tyutin, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A 6**, 3255 (1991).
- [10] See, e.g., J. Gomis, J. Paris and S. Samuel, *Phys. Rep.* **259**, 1 (1995).
- [11] E. Witten, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A 5**, 487 (1990).
- [12] J. Thierry-Mieg, *J. Math. Phys.* **21**, 2834 (1980); *Nuovo Cim.* **56 A**, 396 (1980).
- [13] M. Quiros, F. J. De Urries, J. Hoyos, M. L. Mazou and E. Rodrigues, *J. Math. Phys.* **22**, 767 (1981).
- [14] L. Bonora and M. Tonin, *Phys. Lett.* **B 98**, 48 (1981).
L. Bonora, P. Pasti and M. Tonin, *Nuovo Cim.* **63 A**, 353 (1981).
- [15] L. Baulieu and J. Thierry-Mieg, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 197**, 477 (1982); *ibid.* **B 228**, 259 (1982); L. Alvarez-Gaumé and L. Baulieu, *ibid.* **B 212**, 255 (1983).
- [16] D. S. Huang and C. -Y. Lee, *J. Math. Phys.* **38**, 30 (1997).
- [17] R. P. Malik, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **33**, 2437 (2000) [hep-th/9902146].

- [18] R. P. Malik, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **15**, 1685 (2000) [hep-th/9808040].
- [19] R. P. Malik, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **14**, 1937 (1999) [hep-th/9903121].
- [20] R. P. Malik, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **15**, 2079 (2000) [hep-th/0003128].
- [21] R. P. Malik, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **16**, 477 (2001) [hep-th/9711056].
- [22] R. P. Malik, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **34**, 4167 (2001) [hep-th/0012085].
- [23] E. Harikumar, R. P. Malik and M. Sivakumar,
J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **33**, 7149 (2000) [hep-th/0004145].
- [24] N. Nakanishi and I. Ojima, *Covariant Operator Formalism of Gauge Theories and Quantum Gravity* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1990).
- [25] R. P. Malik, *Phys. Lett. B* **521**, 409 (2001) [hep-th/0108105].
- [26] K. Nishijima, in: *Progress in Quantum Field Theory*, eds. H. Ezawa and S. Kamefuchi (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1986).
- [27] M. Heannaux and C. Teitelboim, *Quantization of Gauge Systems* (Princeton University Press, New Jersey, Princeton, 1992).
- [28] S. Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields: Modern Applications*, **Vol. 2** (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996).
- [29] J. Soda, *Phys. Lett. B* **267**, 214 (1991).
M. Abe and N. Nakanishi, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **89**, 501 (1993).
- [30] G. Curci and R. Ferrari, *Phys. Lett. B* **63**, 51 (1976); *Nuovo Cim. A* **32**, 151 (1976).
- [31] T. Eguchi, P. B. Gilkey and A. J. Hanson, *Phys. Rep.* **66**, 213 (1980).
- [32] S. Mukhi and N. Mukunda, *Introduction to Topology, Differential Geometry and Group Theory for Physicists*, (Wiley Eastern Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 1990).
- [33] J. W. van Holten, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64**, 2863 (1990); *Nucl. Phys. B* **339**, 258 (1990).
- [34] K. Nishijima, *Prog. Theo. Phys.* **80**, 897 (1988) *ibid.* **80**, 905 (1988);
H. Aratyn, *J. Math. Phys.* **31**, 1240 (1990);
G. Fülöp and R. Marnelius, *Nucl. Phys. B* **456**, 442 (1995).
- [35] R. P. Malik, in preparation.